

1 3



SACO MUNICIPAL LANDFILL

PUBLIC HEARING

AUGUST 21, 1996

7:00 P.M.

SACO MIDDLE SCHOOL LIBRARY.

MS. O'DONNELL: Good evening everyone.

I'd like to welcome you to the public hearing on
the Saco Landfill Superfund site. My name is
Mary Jane O'Donnell. I work for EPA in Boston.

I'm a section chief for the Maine, Vermont and
Connecticut Superfund section. In that capacity
I'm responsible for overseeing the cleanup of the
Superfund sites in the state of Maine.

There are a couple of people here with me tonight that I'd like to introduce. There's Ed Hathaway. Ed is the project manager for this site. A couple of people in the back from the State of Maine that I'd like to introduce, two project managers for the site from Maine, Larry Brown and Wilkes Harper. Also, Camille Parrish, who works for the state of Maine, and she's the site geologist. Also here is a court stenographer, Peggy Stockford, and she'll record all of the things that are spoken here tonight at the public hearing.

The purpose of tonight's hearing is to formally accept your comments on EPA's proposed cleanup plan. I'd like to emphasize the word "formal" for those of you who were at our meeting that took place at the end of July, July

31st. Tonight's meeting is a little bit more formal than that meeting. As you can see, we have the court stenographer, and the entire contents of this meeting will be transcribed, and we will be responding to the comments that are raised tonight in a document called a Responsive Summary, and that document will be issued with EPA's final decision document or action memo, which basically summarizes our rationale for the proposed cleanup plan and what that proposed cleanup plan will be.

In terms of the format for tonight's meeting, first Ed is going to give a presentation that will describe the proposed cleanup plan, the EPA's rationale for that plan, and also opportunities for public comment relative to the plan that we're going to be talking about tonight.

A couple of things I do want to emphasize. First of all, if you do wish to make a comment, I'll ask you to please identify yourself and your association with the site, if any at all. And also during the formal part of tonight's meeting Ed and I and the people from the state will not be able to formally respond to your questions.

We're here just to take comments. However, we'll be more than willing to stay after the close of the formal part of the meeting to answer whatever questions you might have.

A couple of other logistical things. The comment period does close on August 31st. I would ask you to submit comments to EPA by that date. In the handouts that you should've received when you came in, and if you didn't, please feel free after the meeting to get a copy of it, is the mailing address to send those comments to us.

Again, just to emphasize, the entire contents of tonight's meeting is going to be transcribed.

With that as background, I'm going to turn things over to Ed, who will discuss the proposed plan, our rationale, and opportunities for public comment.

MR. HATHAWAY: Good evening. Once again, the agenda for tonight's meeting, my section chief, Mary Jane O'Donnell, provided the introduction, I'll provide an overview for the cleanup proposal and the opportunities for public involvement, and Mary Jane will open the hearing

PIESKE REPORTING SERVICE

for comments from the public. We welcome and encourage you to make whatever comments you have to the record for us to respond to in the responsive summary. The hearing will then be closed and I'll be glad to speak to you about any questions or comments you have informally.

Just to provide the setting for the site so we all -- we're all in agreement, we're talking about the Saco Landfill. In particular we're talking about issues to address Areas 3 and 4 at the Saco Municipal Landfill. It's located about a half mile from here off Foss Road.

The action that EPA is proposing to take is basically based upon the studies performed by the city of Saco under EPA and Maine DEP oversight. We're proposing to grate the landfill out, excavate contaminated sediments from the seep area and place them under a cap on Area 4, construct a multi-layer what's called a low hydraulic conductivity cap with surface drainage controls, to maintain the cap, and to provide long-term monitoring and land use restrictions. That is the proposal.

As a setting, the scope of this action is just one part of the overall cleanup process,

4.

Superfund process, for the site. We are going to continue to investigate and evaluate the groundwater, surface water, and sediments. These continuing studies will be collected, and we'll produce a remedial investigation report that will determine whether or not any additional actions are necessary at the site for groundwater, surface water, or sediments.

4.

Things are going very well at the site. We are in a very much accelerated mode to get things done quickly and cost effectively, and that can only be done due to the cooperation that's taken place between the city, the state, and the federal government.

On the July 31st meeting I spent a fair amount of time going over the studies and the result of the study and the reasons for the action that we proposed. Tonight I'm just going to quickly summarize that the data from the investigations that we've performed to date reveal that we do have an area of groundwater contamination, and that area of groundwater contamination is essentially an area surrounding Area 3, 4, and the lower -- an area of lesser contamination surrounding Area 1. This is a very

800-698-1666

PIESKE REPORTING SERVICE

shallow downgrade from Area 1. It's only in the upper sand unit, and it's discharging before it gets to Cousins Pond or the on-site pond.

The contamination in the area of Area 4, as can be seen from this cross-section, is essentially groundwater infiltrating the landfill, going into the sand unit and the bedrock, moving through the bedrock, and discharging to Sandy Brook adjacent to the site, and that's why we have shown this shaded area here. This is essentially the area that has been impacted by the discharge of groundwater to the brook.

The overall objective of this action is to contain the source of groundwater, surface water, and sediment contamination, which we're going to propose to cap the landfill, put a cover on it, shut out the water that's moving into the waste, and, therefore, result in hopefully a cleanup of the groundwater and surface water.

We looked at -- we looked at the site and we developed a set of alternatives as to what are our options for containing the waste of the site. The first assumption that we made was that, in fact, containment is the only viable

option for taking care of landfills, especially landfills that don't have a bottom liner. You can't recirculate the leachate in such landfills; so we weren't able to develop treatment or removal alternatives, because the volume of the landfill is too high and there's no liner in the landfill.

We also made a determination that since the groundwater is not moving through the waste, one of the important determinations that was made through the studies was that we do not have groundwater moving from the side into the waste; therefore, we did not have to develop alternatives to block that flow or collect that flow that would be moving from the center to the waste. We do have that problem at many other sites. Fortunately, we didn't have it here.

We also use the assumption that removal and consolidation of the sediments that were contaminated with arsenic was the best option and really the only viable option for that.

Our final assumption was that the caps that were previously installed in Areas 1 and Areas 2 are acceptable and don't need to be replaced.

Two alternatives were evaluated in a report

4:

- 8

called an Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis. It is available at the library. The first one is That would meet the the basic solid waste cap. minimum requirements of Maine Solid Waste Closure The second is a hazardous waste Regulations. closure cap that would meet the most stringent capping requirements both the federal and state has as waste closure, both regulations and guidance. When we compare alternatives, we compare them based on three factors: The effectiveness, the implementability, and the cost. So we basically looked at those two alternatives.

For each of them we weighed them based on those three criteria, and the end result was a proposal that recommended that alternative two made the most sense for this site. The reasons are that alternative two, the hazardous waste cap, will provide the greatest reduction in leachate generation; is the only alternative that would fully meet all the federal and state regulations and guidance for closing a landfill that receive industrial waste; it would have the most significant impact on groundwater restoration.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

In addition, other factors are that alternative one, the solid waste cap, even when we select an option that was to move towards the solid waste cap, the state of Maine has current guidance that would result in a cap very much similar to alternative two to be constructed as a solid waste cap. They have new guidelines that are in place right now.

11.

Alternative two also contained a double barrier. The double barrier concept provides an added measure of protection, because if the upper barrier leaks, the double barrier basically protects the cap from allowing infiltration into the waste.

Just to give you a quick picture of what that cap would look like, you're essentially looking at five -- five-and-a-half feet of material that would go over the entire waste. It would put a gas ventilator that allows the gas that comes up from the waste to essentially vent into a gas layer and out through vents into the atmosphere. We'd put two feet of a clay or a quarter-inch panel of a clay substitute on top of the gas -- gas ventilator. That is the secondary barrier. The primary barrier is essentially a

sheet of plastic to be placed over the entire landfill, and that prevents any water from getting in. On top of the plastic you put some sand. The sand acts as a drainage material that drains the water away so it doesn't sit on top of that plastic. In case you had a hole in the plastic, the water might drain through. But with the sand on top of it, it encourages the water to move off. Finally, you put enough fill and topsoil on top to grow a good grass cover and to protect the cap from any erosion that might occur under long-term.

4.

What's the bottom line on this proposal?

The bottom line is that the basic capital expenditures to design, build and install the cap and do the quality control is about four million dollars. When you look at taking care of the cap over 30 years, we include monitoring and maintenance, mowing, the present value of those activities are about a million-and-a-half. So the total cost over 30 years of this proposal is five-and-a-half million dollars.

Once again, to, you know, summarize other reasons why we felt this action makes sense at this time, essentially it's timing. Time is

money. We want to get this site cleaned up and controlled as quickly as possible. We think it makes sense to go from the start of the program to cleanup decision in a year. We can go to the start of the program to construction of the control in less than two years. When you look at many other sites throughout the region, you'll see that it may take five or ten years to get to this point in the process and cost a lot more money than we've spent to date. In a very short period of time from a Superfund perspective we will have control over the major source of the contamination.

The other reasons are that it just reenforces the partnership of EPA, the Maine DEP and the city of Saco in trying to be proactive and responsive to the environmental problems out there, and we believe it's the most efficient use of everyone's resources to get the problem solved now and guickly.

I do want to just restate that, you know, your involvement is very important to us. We have placed all the results and information at this site in the public library. It contains the work plans, the engineering evaluation and cost

analysis, and all of our information updates, and we certainly encourage you to go look at that information if you want to learn more about the site.

And, finally, your main way to have involvement in this process is to either send written comments to this address by August 30th or to stand up tonight after I am through and speak your comment into the record, and we will make every effort to respond to those comments at the time that we make the decision.

MS. O'DONNELL: As I said in my -MR. HATHAWAY: I want to thank you for
your time and the opportunity to give you a brief
overview, and I'll turn it back over to Mary
Jane.

MS. O'DONNELL: As I said in my introductory comments, our major purpose for being here tonight is to hear your comments; so what I'd like to do now is just open the floor to anyone who would like to speak tonight and address the cleanup plan that we are proposing. If you could just identify yourself for the court stenographer, that'll be great. Does that mean no one wishes to comment? That's fine. The

1 formal -- Larry? MR. BROWN: I think the state probably 2 3 should make a comment. Larry, just for the 4 MS. O'DONNELL: 5 court stenographer's benefit, if you will --6 MR. BROWN: I'm Larry Brown, the 7 project manager for the state of Maine, Maine 8 Department of Environmental Protection. And I'd 9 just like to say for the record that the state of 10 Maine has -- supports this approach, and we'd 11 just like to commend everyone and the team for 12 having worked so diligently and come up with what 13 we think will be a very functional and efficient 14 operation. 15 MS. O'DONNELL: Thanks, Larry. Anyone 16 else? 17 MS. PATTERSON: My name is Carol 18 Patterson, and I'm here with my husband and my 19 son, John, and we live right in back of the 20 landfill, and I have drafted a letter that I was 21 going to send to Ed Hathaway, and if you don't 22 mind, I'd like to read it. 23 MS. O'DONNELL: That's fine. 24 MS. PATTERSON: We have received the 25 results of the testing of our spring well in our

house, and, as we are pleased with the results of no contamination was detected in our water to date, we still have some concerns with the well contamination from the landfill on our land, Well Number 3 and 4.

We are in favor of the capping of the landfill and finally see a closure to this mess in our backyard. We have lost a great deal of pasture and wooded area for our animals due to contamination of the stream and brooks in this area.

Another concern of the continuing of monitoring of these test wells and an ongoing basis of future years, we do want the contamination -- we do not want the contamination to spread. Future sale of our land and the quality of land and water is of utmost importance. As we are very concerned, we are watching this process very closely.

Like I said, we have had this nightmare in our backyard for many, many years, and I'm glad it's coming to a closure, and we will do anything we can to help support it, but it's a nightmare.

MS. O'DONNELL: Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to make a comment for

4.

the record? I will assume that there isn't, and the formal part of the hearing is closed. Ed and I and the individuals from the state will be here as long as people want us to be here and more than happy to answer whatever questions people might have. We thank you for making the effort to come here tonight, and hopefully we'll see you again at some future meetings that we do have. Thank you.

(THE HEARING WAS CONCLUDED AT APPROX. 7:22 P.M.)

* * * * * * *